

Application No.: 09/914698

Group Art Unit: 1642

REMARKS**Summary of Personal Interview with Examiner**

The telephonic interview conducted with Examiner Fetterolf on June 27, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged. During the interview, amendment of the claims, as indicated above, was discussed. In addition, pursuing claims directed to "fragments" in a subsequently filed application was also discussed.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-3 and 15-21 were under examination as of the issuance of the Final Office Action of December 29, 2005. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 18-21 have been cancelled without prejudice. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-3 and 15-17 will remain pending.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, claim 1 as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

The foregoing amendments and cancellations to the claims should in no way be construed as an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections and have been made solely to expedite examination of the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in this or a separate application(s).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Enablement

Claims 1-3 and 15-21 have been rejected for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states:

...the specification, while being enabling for identifying a substance capable of disrupting microtubule organizing centre (MTOC) integrity by contacting an Asp polypeptide consisting of the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1, does not reasonably provide enablement for identifying a substance capable of disrupting microtubule organizing centre (MTOC) integrity by contacting any and/or all fragments thereof having an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1... (Office Action, page 2)

Application No.: 09/914698

Docket No.: CCI-017US

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to expedite examination and in no way acquiescing to the validity of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove reference to fragments of Asp polypeptides and further to read on Asp polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1. As the Examiner's rejection is based on fragments of Asp polypeptides, Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 render the Examiner's rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of pending claims 1-3 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues or if the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' Attorney would be helpful in expediting prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 227-7400.

Dated: June 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Cynthia L. Kanik

Registration No.: 37,320

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

28 State Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

(617) 227-7400

(617) 742-4214 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant